

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on May 15, 2006, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11-17, 21-22, 24-27, 29, 31 and 34-35 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 14, 27, 29, 31 and 34 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 14, 23, 27, 29 and 31 have been amended. Claims 10, 23 and 32 have been cancelled. A version of the claims containing markings to show the changes made is included hereinabove. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Preliminary Matters

The Examiner stated that, in his opinion, the graphs displayed within the Figures reflect a form of synchronization to the extent that each document is matched (synchronized) to a set of common axes. The Examiner further stated that the documents can be interpreted as synchronized with each other based upon common frames of reference. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. There is no form of "synchronization" going on. Instead properties of documents are correlated (not synchronized) to form a framework reflecting these document properties so that a more informed decision can be made by a user viewing these correlated document properties. If the Examiner is to maintain his position regarding "synchronization", he is asked what exactly is being synchronized. Claim 34 is merely including another document property to be included among the correlation framework, namely a time property indicating the playtime of a file. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and remove the withdrawal regarding claim 34, and to claim 35 which depends from claim 34.

Rejections under §103

Claims 1, 8-14, 21-27 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,671,381 to Strasnick et al. (hereinafter Strasnick)

in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,098,064 to Pirolli et al. (hereinafter Pirolli). Strasnick, discloses at column 4, lines 11-21, a method and apparatus for displaying a three-dimensional navigable display space containing an aggregation of graphical objects and an overview of the aggregation of display objects. A data file appears as a data block within the information landscape.

Strasnick, as stated by the Examiner, does not teach a retrieval time associated with each object. The Examiner cited Pirolli, stating that Pirolli teaches a list associated with collected data regarding document retrieval times. Pirolli teaches using a document retrieval time for determining whether to prefetch and cache documents. Neither Strasnick nor Pirolli (taken alone or in combination) teach using a document retrieval time in the rendering of a document selection display to provide a correlation between a size of a document, an age of a document and a retrieval time for a document in order to provide an indication of document property relationships as recited by claim 1. Further, claim 1 has been amended to include a limitation from claim 10, namely that the rendering of a document selection display further includes a document link display the document link display including a document link associated with the document for which the document identifier is displayed in the correlation framework, and that the receiving a user document selection receiving a selection of the documents link in the document link display.

In the rejection of claim 10, the Examiner stated that Strasnick teaches a hyperlink to other data blocks or to related cells. Thus, Strasnick teaches a hyperlink to **other** cells or blocks, but not to the document being highlighted. The hyperlink of Strasnick cannot be used to select the document being highlighted since the hyperlink of Strasnick can only select "other" cells (documents).

In contrast to Strasnick, amended claim 1 recites displaying a document link display which includes a document link associated with the document for which a document identifier is being displayed. Further, a user selects a document link in the link display to display properties associated with the documents. Strasnick fails to disclose or suggest the same.

-19-

The Examiner rejected claims 2-4 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick in view of Pirolli and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,227 to Freeman et al. (hereinafter Freeman). Claims 2-4 and 15-17 depend from claims 1 or 14 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-4 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick in view of Pirolli and further in view of Freeman is believed to have been overcome.

Regarding claims 34 and 35, as stated above, Applicants believe the withdrawal regarding these claims should be removed.

In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing the claims in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-20-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: SUN01-02(P5870)

Dated: July14, 2006